For the Northern District of California

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTR	ICT OF CALIFORNIA
8	TOR THE NORTHERN DISTR	ICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	VICTORIA MUNOZ,	
10	Plaintiff,	No. C 05-01525 JSW
11	v.	
12	SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL, et al.,	NOTICE OF TENTATIVE RULING AND QUESTIONS
13	Defendants.	ROLLING AND QUESTIONS
14		

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD, PLEASE TAKE NOTICE OF THE FOLLOWING **TENTATIVE** RULING AND QUESTIONS FOR THE HEARING SCHEDULED ON JULY 6, 2007 AT 9:00 A.M.:

The Court has reviewed the parties' papers and, thus, does not wish to hear the parties reargue matters addressed in those pleadings. If the parties intend to rely on authorities not cited in their briefs, they are ORDERED to notify the Court and opposing counsel of these authorities reasonably in advance of the hearing and to make copies available at the hearing. If the parties submit such additional authorities, they are ORDERED to submit the citations to the authorities only, without argument or additional briefing. Cf. N.D. Civil Local Rule 7-3(d). The parties will be given the opportunity at oral argument to explain their reliance on such authority.

The Court tentatively GRANTS Joint Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlements Agreement and Certification of Classes and tentatively GRANTS Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees and Costs to Class Counsel.

1		The parties shall have 10 minutes to address the following questions:
2	1.	Is there anyone present or known to the parties who objects to the proposed settlement or wishes to be excluded from the class? If so, on what basis? Has CalCLAD heard
3		again from the five class members regarding the settlements (see Declaration of J. Kendrick Kresse, ¶ 6)?
4	2.	
5	2.	Is there anyone present or known to the parties who objects to proposed award of attorneys' fees and costs? If so, on what basis?
6 7	3.	Should any potential class member raise an objection between now and July 27, 2007, would such an objection be timely and, if so, how would such an objection be recognized by the Court?
8	4.	Do the parties have any further they wish to address?
9		
10		IT IS SO ORDERED.
11		
12	Dated:	July 2, 2007 JEFFREY 8. WHITE
13		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		